

PATENT
P-US065-A-MG**REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

In the Office Action, the Examiner has stated that "Because applicant did not distinctly and specifically point out the supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election has been treated as an election without traverse. As the applicant did not disagree with the restriction requirement and did not assert that it was made in error, to what "supposed errors" is the Examiner referring?


In the Office Action, the Examiner made a restriction requirement. The Examiner indicated that amended application contains claims directed to ten patentably distinct sub-species of elected Species A (i.e. Species 1 - Species 10).

The Office Action required that the Applicant elect a single species for prosecution on the merits and to provide a listing of claims which are readable thereon. In response to this requirement Applicant elects Species 8, and asserts that claims 1 - 5, 12 - 16, 23, 25, 27, and 28 are readable thereon.

In view of the above election and indication, the application is believed to be ready for substantive examination and is further believed to be in condition for allowance. Upon a finding that a generic claim (e.g. claim 1) is allowable, it is requested that the relevant portion of the withdrawn claims be reconsidered and allowed. If any questions should arise concerning this application, or if it would otherwise be useful to discuss this application, please do not hesitate to contact the undersigned by phone so as to expedite prosecution of this application.

Microfabrica Inc.
7911 Haskell Avenue
Van Nuys, CA 91406
Ph: (818) 786-3322, ext. 105
Fx: (818) 997-3659

Respectfully submitted,



Dennis R. Smalley
Reg. No. 35,364

Best Available Copy

Page 2 of 2

P-US062-A-MF Amendment Letter 2006-09-21.doc